UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,260	08/11/2006	Stephane V. Odent	08350.5368-01000	6054

58982 7590 03/23/2010

CATERPILLAR/FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, L.L.P.
901 New York Avenue, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER	
YUN, CARINA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/23/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/589,260	ODENT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CARINA YUN	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *11 August 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *08/11/2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The Abstract of disclosure is objected to because it includes legal phraseology such as "said" and "comprising".

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-12, 19 and 20 are objected to because of the following informalities: Where a claim sets forth a plurality of elements or steps, each element or step of the claim should be separated by a line indentation, 37 CFR 1.75(i). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohan et al. (FlexFlow: Workflow for Interactive Internet Applications) in view of Matsuba (Patent No. 6,467,078).

Regarding claim 1, Mohan teaches a device operating as a finite state machine and provided for processing events and actions relating to at least one object to be moved between an initial and a final state (Mohan, Fig. 3 on pg. 3, and pg. 4 Flexflow system, the event is Offer and the action is record offer), said device comprising a processing member connected to a memory (Mohan, inherently disclosed, system must have a memory connected to processor), wherein said initial and final state are integrated into at least one event-state-action diagram defining said finite state machine (Mohan, see Fig. 3, pg. 3. examiner notes that the initial state and final state are in one finite state machine), said processing member being also provided for monitoring said states in order to recognize an actual state for said object and for selecting within said state diagram, upon receipt of one of said event-messages (Mohan, see Fig. 4, pg. 5, examiner notes the engine monitors the incoming events, and looks for transition of state), said processing member being further provided for retrieving said actions located at said selected position and

for supplying said retrieved actions to an action dispatcher in order to execute said retrieved action (Mohan, see Fig. 5 on pg. 6, examiner notes, if the action does not fail, the transition action is executed and dispatched), said action dispatcher comprising for each action of said third set an execution routine provided for controlling said execution of said action (Mohan, see Fig. 5, examiner notes, there are three sets of action criteria in Fig. 5).

Mohan suggests but does not clearly disclose said memory having an input connected to a state engine editor and being provided for storing said at least one diagram, said state engine editor having an input for receiving object data, identifying said object and said initial and final state, said object data comprising a first set of states, a second set of events and a third set of actions, said third set comprising a first sub-set of processing actions, a second sub-set of timed actions provided to initiate each time at least one predetermined action of said first sub-set after a predetermined time period has lapsed and a third sub-set of transition actions, said state engine editor being provided for forming said diagram structured as a matrix of said states of said first set and said events of said second set in order to create, at positions within said matrix, a state-event combination, said state engine editor being further provided for attributing to at least one state-event combination at least one of said actions of said third set, said processing member having an input for receiving event-messages and being provided for converting a received event-message into one of said events of said second set a position within said diagram corresponding to said actual state and said event obtained by said converting.

However, Matsuba teaches said memory having an input connected to a state engine editor and being provided for storing said at least one diagram (e.g. editor used to create and edit…storing section of state transition matrix, see Matsuba, col. 9, lines 1-14) said state engine

editor having an input for receiving object data, identifying said object and said initial and final state (Matsuba, inputting section, see col. 9, lines 24-32), said object data comprising a first set of states, a second set of events and a third set of actions (Matsuba, col. 18, lines 27-35, data consisting of state, events, action), said third set comprising a first sub-set of processing actions (Matsuba, see Fig. 11, col. 28, lines 50-58, examiner notes the third subset consists of transitions action that is triggering a state change is a request from CPU to write magnetic data to the card shown in Fig. 11, (cell 1, 1)), a second sub-set of timed actions provided to initiate each time at least one predetermined action of said first sub-set after a predetermined time period has lapsed and a third sub-set of transition actions (Matsuba, see col. 21, lines 50-57, StateChange represents how the object changes with the passage of time), said state engine editor being provided for forming said diagram structured as a matrix of said states of said first set and said events of said second set in order to create, at positions within said matrix, a state-event combination (Matsuba, see Fig. 3, Matrix, see col. 11, lines 66-67 to col.12, lines 1-14, examiner notes state 1, event 2, is represented by cell (1,2)), said state engine editor being further provided for attributing to at least one state-event combination at least one of said actions of said third set (Matsuba, see col. 9, lines 1-7), said processing member having an input for receiving event-messages and being provided for converting a received event-message into one of said events of said second set (Matsuba, see col. 9, lines 34-39, converting positional information by inputting section), a position within said diagram corresponding to said actual state and said event obtained by said converting (Matsuba, see col. 9, lines 24-30). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the

teachings of Mohan and Matsuba because Matsuba allows the system to handle real time event transitions.

Regarding claim 2, Mohan suggests but does not clearly disclose wherein said state engine editor is provided for attributing to each state-event combination, comprising said initial state, an action selected from among said third sub-set. However, Matsuba teaches wherein said state engine editor is provided for attributing to each state-event combination, comprising said initial state, an action selected from among said third sub-set (Matsuba, see col. 11, lines 5-10, see further Fig. 3, editor creates state transition matrix, examiner notes matrix includes initial state). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mohan and Matsuba because Matsuba allows the system to handle real time event transitions.

Regarding claim 3, Mohan suggests but does not clearly disclose wherein said state engine editor is provided for attributing to each state-event combination, comprising said final state, only actions belonging to said first or second sub-set. However, Matsuba teaches wherein said state engine editor is provided for attributing to each state-event combination, comprising said final state, only actions belonging to said first or second sub-set (see Mohan, pg. 2, XML representation, examiner notes matrix includes final states and actions). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mohan and Matsuba because Matsuba allows the system to handle real time event transitions.

Regarding claim 4, Mohan suggests but does not clearly disclose wherein said actions belonging to said third set are predetermined. However, Matsuba teaches wherein said actions

belonging to said third set are predetermined (see Matsuba, Fig. 3, examiner notes action such as writing, reading are predetermined). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mohan and Matsuba because Matsuba allows the system to handle real time event transitions.

Regarding claim 5, Mohan suggests but does not clearly disclose wherein said events belonging to said second set are predetermined. However, Matsuba teaches wherein said events belonging to said second set are predetermined (see Matsuba, see col. 31, lines 65-67 event inputting). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mohan and Matsuba because Matsuba allows the system to handle real time event transitions.

Regarding claim 6, Mohan teaches wherein each diagram is identified by a description thereof and a reference to the object to which it belongs(see Mohan, pg. 2, XML representation).

Regarding claim 7, Mohan teaches wherein each state is identified by a description thereof and a reference to the diagram to which it belongs (see Mohan, pg. 2, XML representation).

Regarding claim 8, Mohan teaches wherein each event is identified by a description thereof and a reference to the object to which it belongs (see Mohan, pg. 2, XML representation).

Regarding claim 9, Mohan teaches wherein each action is identified by a description thereof (see Mohan, pg. 2, XML representation).

Regarding claim 10, Mohan teaches wherein said state engine editor is provided for forming said diagrams with an XML description (see Mohan, pg. 2, XML representation).

Regarding claim 11, Mohan suggests but does not clearly disclose wherein each transition action of said third sub-set comprises a reference to an event of said second set, a source and a target state as well as a reference to said diagram to which it belongs. However, Matsuba teaches wherein each transition action of said third sub-set comprises a reference to an event of said second set, a source and a target state as well as a reference to said diagram to which it belongs (Matsuba, see Fig. 7, examiner notes each event has a reference). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mohan and Matsuba because Matsuba allows the system to handle real time event transitions.

Regarding claim 12, Mohan suggests but does not clearly disclose wherein said first sub-set comprises a first class of generic actions and a second class of specific actions identified by a reference to the object to which it belongs. However, Matsuba teaches wherein said first sub-set comprises a first class of generic actions and a second class of specific actions identified by a reference to the object to which it belongs (Matsuba, see Fig. 7, examiner notes each action has a reference). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mohan and Matsuba because Matsuba allows the system to handle real time event transitions.

Regarding claim 13, Mohan teaches a method for processing, within a finite state machine, events and actions relating to at least one object to be moved between an initial and a final state (Mohan, Fig. 3 on pg. 3, and pg. 4 Flexflow system, the event is Offer and the action is record offer), wherein said method comprises: receiving object data identifying said at least one object and said initial and final state (Mohan, See Fig. 3, pg. 3, initial state is start, final state is

deal), integrating said initial and final state into said diagram (Mohan, see Fig. 3, pg. 3. examiner notes that the initial state and final state are in one finite state machine); recognizing said at least one object into said received event-message (Mohan, see Fig. 4, pg. 5, examiner notes the engine monitors the incoming events, and looks for transition of state); monitoring said states in order to recognize an actual state for said recognized object and selecting within said state diagram upon receipt of one of said event-messages, (Mohan, see Fig. 4, pg. 5, examiner notes the engine monitors the incoming events, and looks for transition of state) retrieving said actions located at said selected position and executing said retrieved action by processing an execution routine provided for controlling said execution of said retrieved action (Mohan, see Fig. 5, examiner notes, there are three sets of action criteria in Fig. 5).

Mohan suggests but does not clearly disclose said object data comprising a first set of states, a second set of events and a third set of actions, said third set comprising a first sub-set of processing actions, a second sub-set of timed actions provided to initiate each time at least one predetermined action of said first sub-set after a predetermined time period has lapsed and a third sub-set of transition actions; forming at least one event-state-action diagram defined in a final state machine pattern of said finite state machine by structuring said states of said first set and said events of said second set as a matrix in order to create at positions within said matrix, each time, a state-event combination; attributing to at least one state-event combination at least one of said actions of said third set; receiving event-messages relating to said at least one object and converting a received event-message into one of said events of said second set; a position within said diagram corresponding to said actual state and said event obtained by said converting.

However, Matsuba teaches said object data comprising a first set of states, a second set of events and a third set of actions (Matsuba, col. 18, lines 27-35, data consisting of state, events, action), said third set comprising a first sub-set of processing actions, a second sub-set of timed actions provided to initiate each time at least one predetermined action of said first sub-set after a predetermined time period has lapsed and a third sub-set of transition actions (Matsuba, see Fig. 11, col. 28, lines 50-58, examiner notes the third subset consists of transitions action that is triggering a state change is a request from CPU to write magnetic data to the card shown in Fig. 11, (cell 1, 1)); forming at least one event-state-action diagram defined in a final state machine pattern of said finite state machine by structuring said states of said first set and said events of said second set as a matrix in order to create at positions within said matrix, each time, a state-event combination (Matsuba, see Fig. 3, Matrix, see col. 11, lines 66-67 to col.12, lines 1-14, examiner notes state 1, event 2, is represented by cell (1,2)); attributing to at least one state-event combination at least one of said actions of said third set (Matsuba, see Fig. 11, col. 28, lines 50-58, examiner notes the third subset consists of transitions action that is triggering a state change is a request from CPU to write magnetic data to the card shown in Fig. 11, (cell 1, 1)); receiving event-messages relating to said at least one object and converting a received event-message into one of said events of said second set (Matsuba, see col. 9, lines 34-39, converting positional information by inputting section); a position within said diagram corresponding to said actual state and said event obtained by said converting (Matsuba, see col. 9, lines 24-30). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mohan and Matsuba because Matsuba allows the system to handle real time event transitions.

Regarding claim 14, Mohan teaches wherein said at least one object includes plural objects, said objects classified by object types (see Fig. 3, pg. 3, 2 objects, classified as buyer and seller), each object being identified by a definition and a description of the object type to which it belongs (see Mohan, pg. 2, see XML representation which has definition and description of objects), and wherein a plurality of event-state-action diagrams are formed for each object, each diagram corresponding to one of said object types (see state diagram in Visual Modeling tool, Fig. 1), said monitoring further comprising a selection of at least one of said diagrams based on said object type (Mohan, see Fig. 4, pg. 5, examiner notes the engine monitors the incoming events, and looks for transition of state).

Regarding claim 15, Mohan does not clearly disclose wherein said object types are predetermined. However, Matsuba teaches wherein said object types are predetermined (see Fig. 27, object S2 is predetermined). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mohan and Matsuba because Matsuba allows the system to handle real time event transitions.

Regarding claim 16, Mohan teaches wherein said at least one object includes a plurality of objects (see Fig. 3, pg. 3, 2 objects, classified as buyer and seller), and for each of the plurality of objects, at least one dedicated event-state-action diagram is formed (see Mohan see Fig. 2, event, state, action, diagram), said event-messages comprising an object identifier (see Mohan, pg. 2, see XML representation which has definition and description of objects), said monitoring further comprising a selection of at least one of said diagrams based on said identified object (Mohan, see Fig. 4, pg. 5, examiner notes the engine monitors the incoming events, and looks for transition of state).

Regarding claim 17, Mohan teaches wherein said at least one object includes a plurality of objects (see Fig. 3, pg. 3, 2 objects, classified as buyer and seller), and for each of the plurality of objects, at least one dedicated event-state-action diagram is formed (see Mohan see Fig. 2, event, state, action, diagram), said event-messages comprising an object identifier (see Mohan, pg. 2, see XML representation which has definition and description of objects), said monitoring further comprising a selection of at least one of said diagrams based on said identified object (Mohan, see Fig. 4, pg. 5, examiner notes the engine monitors the incoming events, and looks for transition of state).

Regarding claim 18, Mohan teaches a method for processing, within a finite state machine, events and actions relating to at least one object to be moved between an initial and a final state (Mohan, Fig. 3 on pg. 3, and pg. 4 Flexflow system, the event is Offer and the action is record offer), wherein said method comprises: recognizing said at least one object into said received event-message (Mohan, see Fig. 4, pg. 5, examiner notes the engine monitors the incoming events, and looks for transition of state); monitoring said states in order to recognize an actual state for said recognized object (Mohan, see Fig. 4, pg. 5, examiner notes the engine monitors the incoming events, and looks for transition of state); wherein said at least one object includes plural objects, said objects classified by object types (Mohan, see Fig. 3, pg. 3, 2 objects, classified as buyer and seller), each object being identified by a definition and a description of the object type to which it belongs, and wherein a plurality of event-state-action diagrams are formed for each object each diagram corresponding to one of said object types, (see Mohan, pg. 2, see XML representation which has definition and description of objects), said monitoring further comprising a selection of at least one of said diagrams based on said object

type(Mohan, see Fig. 4, pg. 5, examiner notes the engine monitors the incoming events, and looks for transition of state); and wherein said at least one object includes a plurality of objects, and for each of the plurality of objects, at least one dedicated event-state-action diagram is formed (Mohan, see state diagram in Visual Modeling tool, Fig. 1), said event-messages comprising an object identifier, said monitoring further comprising a selection of at least one of said diagrams based on said identified object (see Mohan, pg. 2, see XML representation which has definition and description of objects).

Mohan does not clearly disclose receiving object data identifying said at least one object and said initial and final state, said object data comprising a first set of states, a second set of events and a third set of actions, said third set comprising a first sub-set of processing actions; a second sub-set of timed actions provided to initiate each time at least one predetermined action of said first sub-set after a predetermined time period has lapsed and a third sub-set of transition actions; forming at least one event-state-action diagram defined in a final state machine pattern of said finite state machine by structuring said states of said first set and said events of said second set as a matrix in order to create at positions within said matrix, each time, a state-event combination; integrating said initial and final state into said diagram; attributing to at least one state-event combination at least one of said actions of said third set; receiving event-messages relating to said at least one object and converting a received event-message into one of said events of said second set; and selecting within said state diagram upon receipt of one of said event-messages a position within said diagram corresponding to said actual state and said event obtained by said converting retrieving said actions located at said selected position and executing

said retrieved action by processing an execution routine provided for controlling said execution of said retrieved action; wherein said object types are predetermined.

However, Matsuba teaches receiving object data identifying said at least one object and said initial and final state, said object data comprising a first set of states, a second set of events and a third set of actions(Matsuba, col. 18, lines 27-35, data consisting of state, events, action), said third set comprising a first sub-set of processing actions(Matsuba, see Fig. 11, col. 28, lines 50-58, examiner notes the third subset consists of transitions action that is triggering a state change is a request from CPU to write magnetic data to the card shown in Fig. 11, (cell 1, 1)), a second sub-set of timed actions provided to initiate each time at least one predetermined action of said first sub-set after a predetermined time period has lapsed and a third sub-set of transition actions(Matsuba, see col. 21, lines 50-57, StateChange represents how the object changes with the passage of time); forming at least one event-state-action diagram defined in a final state machine pattern of said finite state machine by structuring said states of said first set and said events of said second set as a matrix in order to create at positions within said matrix, each time, a state-event combination; integrating said initial and final state into said diagram (Matsuba, see Fig. 3, Matrix, see col. 11, lines 66-67 to col.12, lines 1-14, examiner notes state 1, event 2, is represented by cell (1,2)); attributing to at least one state-event combination at least one of said actions of said third set (Matsuba, see col. 9, lines 1-7); receiving event-messages relating to said at least one object and converting a received event-message into one of said events of said second set (Matsuba, see col. 9, lines 34-39, converting positional information by inputting section); and selecting within said state diagram upon receipt of one of said event-messages a position within said diagram corresponding to said actual state and said event obtained by said

converting (Matsuba, see col. 9, lines 24-30) retrieving said actions located at said selected position and executing said retrieved action by processing an execution routine provided for controlling said execution of said retrieved action (Matsuba, see col. 9, lines 34-39, converting positional information by inputting section); wherein said object types are predetermined (Matsuba, see Fig. 27, object S2 is predetermined). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mohan and Matsuba because Matsuba allows the system to handle real time event transitions.

Regarding claim 19, Mohan does not clearly disclose wherein said state engine editor is provided for attributing to each state-event combination, comprising said final state, only actions belonging to said first or second sub-set. However, Matsuba teaches wherein said state engine editor is provided for attributing to each state-event combination, comprising said final state, only actions belonging to said first or second sub-set (e.g. editor used to create and edit…storing section of state transition matrix, see Matsuba, col. 9, lines 1-14).

Regarding claim 20, Mohan does not clearly disclose wherein said actions belonging to said third set are predetermined. However, Matsuba teaches wherein said actions belonging to said third set are predetermined (see Matsuba, Fig. 3, examiner notes action such as writing, reading are predetermined). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Mohan and Matsuba because Matsuba allows the system to handle real time event transitions.

Examiner Notes

6. Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Support for Amendments and Newly Added Claims

7. Applicants are respectfully requested, in the event of an amendment to claims or submission of new claims, that such claims and their limitations be directly mapped to the specification, which provides support for the subject matter. This will assist in expediting compact prosecution. MPEP 714.02 recites: "Applicant should also specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP § 2163.06. An amendment which does not comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.121(b), (c), (d), and (h) may be held not fully responsive. See MPEP § 714." **Amendments not pointing to specific support in the disclosure may be deemed as not complying with provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.131(b), (c), (d), and (h) and therefore held not fully responsive.** Generic statements such as "Applicants believe no new matter has been introduced" may be deemed insufficient.

Interview Requests

8. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.133(a)(3), requests for interview must be made in advance. Interview requests are to be made by telephone (571-270-7864) call or FAX (571-270-8864).

Applicants must provide a detailed agenda as to what will be discussed (generic statement such as "discuss §102 rejection" or "discuss rejections of claims 1-3" may be denied interview). The detail agenda along with any proposed amendments is to be written on a PTOL-413A or a custom form and should be faxed (or emailed, subject to MPEP 713.01.I / MPEP 502.03) to the Examiner at least 3 days prior to the scheduled interview.

Interview requests submitted within amendments may be denied because the Examiner was not notified, in advance, of the Applicant Initiated Interview Request and due to time constraints may not be able to review the interview request to prior to the mailing of the next Office Action.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CARINA YUN whose telephone number is (571)270-7848. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 9.30am-6.30pm; alt. Fri, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, SAM SOUGH can be reached on (571)272-6799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. Y./
Examiner, Art Unit 2194

/Hyung S. Sough/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2194
03/19/10